

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 604

CS 203 722

AUTHOR Manchikes, Alice W., Ed.
TITLE [Censorship and Other Issues.]
INSTITUTION Kentucky Council of Teachers of English,
Louisville.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 25p.; The Kentucky Council of Teachers of English is
an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of
English
JOURNAL CIT Kentucky English Bulletin; v24 n2 Entire Issue Win
1974-1975
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Audiovisual Aids; Awards;
*Censorship; *Educational Objectives; Elementary
Secondary Education; *English Instruction; Higher
Education; Literacy; Literary Analysis; *School
Community Relationship; Values
IDENTIFIERS Hemingway (Ernest); Tennessee

ABSTRACT

The five articles in this journal issue discuss attempts to censor certain nonprint media in the schools, the conflict between intellectual freedom and community values, recent efforts by Tennessee educators and librarians to achieve a better measure of intellectual freedom, the need for English teachers to reexamine their teaching methods and priorities in view of declining literacy among students, and the theme of alienation in a short story by Ernest Hemingway. (GW)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED146604

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Kentucky English Bulletin

Member NCTE Information Exchange Agreement

Volume 24

Winter 1974-75

Number 2

EDITORIAL STAFF

Editor

MAURICE A. HATCH
University of Kentucky

Associate Editor

WILLSON E. WOOD
Western Kentucky University

Guest Editor

ALICE W. MANCHIKES
Eastern Kentucky University

[Censorship and Other Issues]

CONTENTS

1974 NCTE Achievement Awards for Kentucky	3
Core, Filth, And Communism: Ken Donelson	5
Intellectual Freedom vs. the Community Values: Virginia B. Saddler	10
Intellectual Freedom in Tennessee: Edwin S. Gleaves	15
On the Seduction of Teachers of English: James E. Barcus	21
Alienation Times Seven in Hemingway's "Soldier's Home": Daniel R. Silkowski	32
Announcing the Nineteenth Annual Student Writing Issue	38

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kentucky Council of
Teachers of English

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Published by the Kentucky Council of Teachers of English, with the cooperation and assistance of the Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Kentucky.

CONTRIBUTIONS: Articles are invited and should be submitted to the editor.

SUBSCRIPTION: Subscription to the *Bulletin* is included in the annual membership dues (\$2), which should be sent to Michael McNeily, Providence High School, Providence, Ky. New rate, effective 1 September, 1974: \$4.

CS 203722

GORE, FILTH, AND COMMUNISM: CENSORSHIP COMES TO NON-PRINT MEDIA

KEN DONELSON

English Department, Arizona State University
(Written especially for the Kentucky English Bulletin)

Several months ago, I attended a meeting of English teachers where the most prominent of the speakers was a noted film critic. Instead of addressing herself to the topic of film criticism which I think most of us expected and wanted, she talked about using film in the English classroom. Sincere though she doubtless was, she wound up alienating several of us by discussing the film version of *The Exorcist*, warning us that it was a "trashy" film, and suggesting that teachers must act as guides for students, meaning that the teacher must show how bad the film is as a way of cutting down student attendance. The film may well be "trashy" (I haven't seen it) and it may well be an exercise in horror and wallowing in sensationalism. But I'll be damned if I believe that my role as an English teacher consists of keeping up with what students like so I can promulgate the truth to them and talk them into believing that my view of anything is the right or proper view of truth. I believe that an English teacher should be a guide, but there is a vast difference between education (looking at and thinking about many visions of the truth to determine one's own purview of reality and truth) and indoctrination (telling students the truth so they will recognize the teacher's word as precise knower and keeper of the truth).

I mention this example because only in the last few years has there been a growing sentiment for censorship of non-print media in the schools. The rise of R and X-rated movies at the local cinema accounts in part for this, but the growing use of non-print media in the English classroom also in part accounts for the growing censorship (overt or by suggesting that the teacher act as a "guide"). As long as teachers stuck with films like the ubiquitous "Our Friend, The Introductory Adverbial Clause" or "Let Us Worship at the Bust of Shakespeare" or "Diagraming: The Way to the Good Life and God" those teachers were safe. They may have bored students, but parents and administrators and school boards and other teachers were likely either to ignore the films or to praise them, almost never to criticize them. As long as English teachers stuck with safe recordings of Shakespearian plays or safely dead poets, they were safe. As long as English teachers were horrified by non-print media machinery, they were safe. But in the last few years, more and more English teachers have become aware of new and exciting and provocative and stimulating short films, just as they have become aware of modern records and tape recordings, just as many have learned how to use transparencies and slides, just as many have learned how to make non-print media materials aimed specifically as their own classrooms.

As English teachers became aware of new materials and even learned how to create their own non-print materials for their classes, some parents and administrators became aware of the new English classroom. Those same parents and administrators have in many cases become our modern censors. With no pretense of any completeness, I'd like to mention some of the cases of censorship involving non-print media in the English classroom that have come to my attention in the last couple of years. Some readers may regard certain of these episodes as unlikely horror stories (I can verify each one) or atypical. Unhappily, too many episodes have taken place quite recently to make me believe that the incidents cited below are a typical or untypical. I will confine my examples to incidents of short films or slide-tapes used in the English classroom, though even the most casual reader of newspapers or magazines must have encountered some more public examples of non-print media censorship, notably the two episodes of "Maude" involving abortion, the "Sticks and Bones" TV production by David Rabe which caused a furor only a year ago, or the many irritated responses to the televised production of "That Certain Summer," a play which concerned homosexuality and which some viewers seemed to see as less human than proselyting.

Censorship of Short Films

These short films may or may not be widely used or representative of the kind of short films English teachers could use in the classroom, but all of them have come under recent attack.

"Future Shock," the funeral pontifications of Orson Welles about Toffler's recent best seller, has been banned in at least two school districts, one by an administrator for no given reason, the other by an administrator because the "film would depress young people."

"I Am Joaquin," based on Rudolfo Gonzales' book about the manhood and history of Mexican-Americans, was banned in one school because "it is considered too inflammatory" even though Chicano kids were the majority of the school population.

"Time Piece," an absurdist portrait of man today, was banned in one California school because the AV coordinator "saw something in it he didn't like," and it was banned in a Midwestern school district after a parent phoned a local radio station commenting, "I hear they're showing dirty movies at the high school."

"Star Spangled Banner," a short film about the death of a young American soldier in battle, was objected to as "obviously anti-American."

"The Lottery," the filmed version of Shirley Jackson's story, was objected to by one mother because it was "anti-American and anti-establishment" and it was banned from one school district because "It was just too strong for immature minds . . . There are so many nice movies kids could be seeing . . . The film was sort of brutal."

"Skater Dater," a film about a young boy's initiation into the world of love, was objected to for a very odd reason. During one scene, the young boy is near a fountain where water spills from the breast of a female nude statue. The censorious administrator who wanted "Skater Dater" out of his school apparently balked at the real objection he felt, that of the nudity of the statue. Rather he stated that "a picture showing youngsters on skateboards was a safety hazard" and the film was effectively removed from viewing.

"The Base Fiddle," a contemporary filmed version of a Chekov short story, was objected to by a teacher apparently troubled by the tiny bit of nudity in the film. The teacher suggested that "Somebody in authority better take a look at *that* film before it's shown to students."

"Night and Fog," Alain Resnais' striking and memorable picture of man's inhumanity to man during the time of the German concentration camps, was objected to because it was "too brutal" and because it was "a terrible thing to show to anyone. Besides, my kids aren't responsible for things like that."

"An Occurrence at Owl Creek Bridge," almost a classic among short films, was objected to because there was "too much violence" and "It's obviously a pro-Communist film."

Censorship of Slide-Tape Materials

While slide-tape material, student or teacher prepared, is relatively new to the English classroom, such material has come under attack. The following quotations and comments come from a series of newspaper articles or letters to the editor of the *Arizona Daily Sun* (Flagstaff, Arizona), all concerned with a series of twelve slide-tape presentations prepared for English courses or an English-History elective in the secondary schools of Flagstaff. In what turned out to be one of the few moments of objectivity surrounding the dispute, the staff writer of the *Sun* described the teaching materials in this way.

About 800 persons nearly filled the Flagstaff High School auditorium Monday night to watch a two-hour presentation of the 12 audio-visual programs before the board took action.

The slides presented material taken mostly from magazines, pictures touching on a variety of subjects from poverty and affluence, to patriotism and anti-war feelings, to pollution. Contemporary music with vocalists from Frank Sinatra to the Beatles was played with the visuals, sometimes to heighten the effect of the slides and sometimes to conflict. (Aug. 18, 1970)

If the material described sounds mildly commonplace to English teachers, it sounded dangerous and un-American to some parents in the Flagstaff area. During the summer and fall of 1970 and then later in 1973, a number of letters to the editor appeared in the *Arizona Daily Sun*, many of them violently opposed to the material being used with a grow-

ing number attacking the APEX elective program as the spawner of all evil non-print media materials. The quotations below are only a tiny fraction of the prose that spewed forth on the topic of non-print media materials in the English classroom, but the quotations below may give the reader some idea of the venom many parents reserve for dubious innovations in the schools, dubious here defined as new and dangerous, probably Communist, certainly subversive.

... Now that so many concerned parents have reviewed the shocking vulgarities of the Program's 'Big Spender,' the morbid, distorted concentration of every dregs of life in American under the heading of 'POVERTY USA,' and the hate-inciting effrontery to our founding fathers and the American Indian, entitled 'MY COUNTRY TIS OF —,' we can face the fact that our school children are being brainwashed with gross negativity from week to week right in their own classrooms. ... To continually flaunt the degeneracies of life before the formative, pliable, impressive minds of our children today is to build a blueprint of their tomorrows. The Pilot Program is further taking care of this injury through a very subtle combination of slides and song about the year 2025 A.D., instilling into the vision of our youths a dearth of beauty and an abundance of void and hopelessness.

To infiltrate such atrocities into the ideals of our helpless school children is such a betrayal of America and the confidence vested in public instructors, we are shocked to learn this unwholesome Program has not been unanimously censored by our School Board. (May 25, 1970)

Perhaps the persons who initiated this program did so feeling that our children need to be made aware of problems which do exist in our land. However, I feel that the problems of our United States have been taken out of context.

... this program nothing more than derogatory propaganda against our wonderful country.

...
This program, as it stands, is entirely negative in approach and a completely negative approach to anything is biased and of no use as a teaching aid. These extremes in method need not be employed to explain our difficulties. (June 2, 1970)

We Parents On Watch want our children's character developed, and their loyalties to God, family, and country maintained. How can the natural, ingenuous mind of a child cope with defaming religion, undermining family structure, desecrating our flag? How can he understand slandering public officials and American serviceman, downgrading capitalism and free enterprise, propagandizing about so-called 'police brutality,' and incitement to revolution? Why should he be subjected to Las Vegas dancing girls and excerpts from 'Hair'? (June 9, 1970)

There is a force at work today that is bent on destroying the soul of human beings via Narcotics, Subversive music, premature interest in sex, Pornography, Brainwashing, Hate therapy and there are organizations to back the 'Fall of America'.

...
Dispense with the rock and roll music (this is characteristic of

communistic brainwashing) and we parents just don't go for communism. (June 23, 1970)

In order that you might better understand my personal thinking, may I ask that you give considerable thought to the rules set down by Lenin which we seem to be allowing to become a part of our way of life and which today may be affecting the minds and decisions of so many of our potentially fine youth.

You will recall, I am sure, that Lenin advocated and strongly taught, as many of our own people are knowingly or unknowingly doing today, that the minds of people should be taken off of the constructive affairs of the government by focusing attention on sexy books and plays. We know how this has progressed in America. Lenin advocated the destruction of the people's faith in their natural leaders which appears to me to be done in the film strips of the Pilot program. His teachings advocated creating an unbalanced government budget along with government extravagances, destruction of credit, a growing fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent in a country. This is exactly what I can see in these film strips. (June 26, 1970)

The proposed slide-tape teaching method has been generally described as one of the most effective brain washing systems yet devised. Since it has this potential I would not like to see it used either to sell America or to reject America . . . or any thing else. Like nitroglycerin, a wee bit administered by an MD may be a good thing, but any amount in some one else's hand may be disastrous. (August 13, 1970)

Floyd Hanson, speaking of one slide tape, said 'We have laws against polluting the rivers and the water. Why don't we have laws against polluting our children's minds?' The tape is shown with the unit about minorities and deals with the alleged mistreatment of the American Indian.

'Most people don't want the slide tapes. They show too much negativism,' Michael Burnett told the board. 'They are bending a child's mind to a wrong point of view.' (January 16, 1973)

Tape slides, which are used in the APEX program and other areas in the schools, also are under fire by the two groups.

'The slide tapes are un-American,' Mrs. Burnett said. 'Any tape slide that says America is a nation of leeches and that the bill of rights failed is un-American.' She is referring to a tape slide used in the Minority Voice class by Buffy Ste. Marie called 'My Country 'Tis of Thy People, You're Dying.'

Mrs. Shafer says the tape slides are very close to sensitivity training. 'Where does any of this stop?' she asked.

'We can nitpick, but the whole crux of the thing is APEX itself. It's failing under their (the school administration's) own supervision.

'The permissiveness and all—they bring it in and give it respect. It is condoned and it leaves the student confused, frustrated and misguided,' Mrs. Shafer said.

'Even if English is boring, so what? That is part of the growing process,' Mrs. Burnett said. 'Boredom makes you enjoy it when things are really interesting. There is nothing wrong with being bored.' (February 19, 1973)

In a recent paper one of my graduate students wrote, the author talked about whether the purpose of English teaching is to protect or to inform. She concluded as I do that we can neither fully protect nor inform our students. What we can do is to protect them from evil by making sure that they are as informed as possible. I believe that we must allow, even encourage, students to have access to every possible source of ideas or feelings or information. Increasingly, non-print media have achieved a position as significant if not yet quite as honored as books and other print media. We must fight the censor of non-print media material just as we must fight the censor of print material. Not to do so makes us non-professional and derelict in our responsibilities to our students.

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM vs. THE COMMUNITY VALUES DILEMMA

VIRGINIA B. SADDLER
Union College, Barboursville, Ky.

On June 21, 1973, the Supreme Court ruling that the local community would be charged with the responsibility of defining obscenity for itself thus rid itself of materials deemed obscene by local community standards. On the surface it seems like a very democratic decision, but study of the problems involved in arriving at a definition of obscenity acceptable to a majority of people shows that the task is far from easy. The Supreme Court spent 130 years of costly court fights to arrive at a definition that most of us could live by. Now each community is to arrive at its own definition, when in truth most individuals in the community would have a hard time defining the term for themselves alone.

The Supreme Court decision presents every educator with a dilemma regarding two concepts we hold dear, intellectual freedom and community values. How can one cling to the belief in intellectual freedom and still concern himself with community values, for the two are clearly at odds with one another. By its very nature, community values require definitions and definitions have boundaries beyond which one dares not go. Intellectual freedom on the other hand, by its very nature, cannot tolerate boundaries or restrictions of any kind. How then can an educator espouse intellectual freedom and at the same time still uphold community values? Every teacher, librarian, school administrator, or board member not only must concern himself with the problem these two concepts can cause, but must have thought out his position on the matter well before he is presented with an explosive attack that does not afford the best climate for rational, professional thinking.

Books that are sitting on our library shelves, that are being assigned in our English classes, are going to be targets of censorship by members of

our community that hold a narrow definition of obscenity. Joan Baez's autobiography *Daybreak* was removed in one community for use of a "dirty" word used to illustrate how children pick up bad habits of their elders. According to Judith Krug, Director of the Office of Academic Freedom of the American Library Association, *Go Ask Alice* and *Catcher in the Rye* are being removed from library shelves at the rate of three and four a week, usually within 24 hours after anyone objects to them¹. Probably the most frightening aspect of the Court's decision is that the teacher, bookseller, and librarian are presumed to have knowledge that a book is obscene before the community has rendered its verdict; if they are arrested on a criminal charge, they have no redress from the Supreme Court.

Whether we like it or not, as teachers and librarians we are caught in the middle of the controversy between intellectual freedom and community values. All of us are sponsored by some governmental unit, and that governmental unit gives direction to our undertakings. When the governmental unit is a strong advocate of intellectual freedom, as is the case in most of our colleges and universities, there is no dilemma. When, however, the governmental unit restricts intellectual freedom, for whatever purpose, the teachers and librarians are faced with dilemmas regarding definitions of values. It is to our governmental units then that we must sell the concept of intellectual freedom and show how it is compatible with community values.

If we asked for a definition of values from every member of the community, what do you suppose we would get? Would any two agree? A value is something we hold in high regard, often a treasured nostalgic reflection on something we personally hold to be good and worthwhile. We would all doubtless agree that a value represents a commodity to be preserved, but that would be a subjective personal definition, something that doesn't really lend itself well to definition. Cleanliness and honesty would be values most of us would agree on; therefore we would want clean books and honest books. But the truth of the matter is you can't always have an honest book and keep it clean; this is where our dilemma presents itself. An honest book about the ghetto reflects the language of the ghetto and the ugliness of life in the ghetto. Can we ban the ghetto by simply removing honest books about the ghetto? Can we tidy up the ghetto by writing dishonest books about it; or by writing nothing about the ghetto have it disappear all together? Defining community values and then applying them to our reading materials, however, is not the only problem.

Who defines the values for us? Who will be the spokesmen? How do you define the community, and what instrument can you draw up to measure exactly the values that individuals in the community hold dear? Jefferson County Judge Todd Hollenbach announced formation of the Jefferson County Commission on Community Standards Related to Obscenity within a week of the Supreme Court decision. The aim of this

commission (chaired by Monsignor Alfred F. Horrigan) is to find out what the "contemporary community standards" are within the borders of Jefferson County; it was prompted by fear "that law enforcement agencies might have started arresting everybody in sight who sells *Playboy* or *Penthouse*."² The commission plans public hearings, solicitation of scholarly statements, a fact-finding study of the pornographic trade, and a public opinion survey about what people consider to be obscene. Some experts feel that no matter how well-constructed the survey and research may be, the commission will be unable to come up with a "contemporary community standard" because quite simply no such standard exists.

Let us suppose, however, that commissions such as the one in Jefferson County are successful and can provide a definition of values that would be acceptable to our respective communities, and then listen to the words of Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock* and ponder its meaning.

Value turnover is now faster than ever before in history. While in the past a man growing up in a society would expect that its public value system would remain largely unchanged in his lifetime, no such assumption is warranted today, except perhaps in the most isolated of pre-technological communities.

This implies temporariness in the structure of both public and personal value systems, and it suggests that WHATEVER the content of values that arise to replace those of the industrial age, they will be shorter-lived, more ephemeral than the values of the past. There is no evidence whatsoever that the value systems of the technosocieties are likely to return to a "steady state" condition. For the foreseeable future, we must anticipate still more rapid change.³

If we successfully defined values for a particular moment in time, must we then be tied to them from then on, while new values have already risen to replace them? Where would progress be were we to bind ourselves to yesterday's values? Community value definitions are constantly changing, reshaping, never static and never clear.

In the matter of intellectual freedom one is committed to the belief that an individual is free to read whatever he wants to read, to roam as widely as he pleases. By the same token he is free to reject what he does not wish to read. This is the other side of the intellectual freedom coin. The intellectually free person bristles at being a captive audience. He doesn't mind what people do, so long as they don't do it in the street and stop the traffic. He doesn't challenge someone else's freedom until it infringes on his own.

While intellectual freedom grants one the privilege of rejecting information he doesn't wish to read, the discipline required in education does not give one that privilege. Herein lies a dilemma for the classroom teacher that doesn't exist for the librarian. Selecting reading matter from a wide variety of materials on library shelves allows one to practice intellectual freedom, but requiring the reading of certain materials for an appreciation of a classroom assignment takes away from the individual's freedom. At this point educators coming to terms with another

problem must recognize that education calls for discipline which takes the choice out of what students read to advance their knowledge of a subject. The guideline to be used in this case must be honesty—honesty in textbooks and honesty in supplementary reading. Teachers must be granted the intellectual freedom to determine what materials best serve this end in the teaching of their subjects, and school boards must recognize the professional responsibility of the teacher in this choice. If the materials come under question, the question should be limited to the intellectual honesty of the material that is required reading.

The Supreme Court in its definition of obscenity used a patent offensiveness clause as an additional test of obscenity. The court decreed that the manner in which material is placed before the public helps cinch the definition of obscenity. As teachers and librarians we can profit by this lesson of caution in our attempt to promote one value over another. David Berninghausen injected such a word of caution to librarians in his article, "Social Responsibility vs. the Library Bill of Rights."⁴ He offended many librarians when he accused them of acting as censors in the name of social responsibility. James Harvey in his article, "Acting For the Children?" accused librarians of acting as censors when they went over their book collections and reevaluated them in light of today's values.⁵

Clearly all of us, teachers and librarians alike, have given in to pressures on the nature of our book collections and reading lists. We have given in to censorship from the outside in the matter of obscenity and community values. We have given in to "selection" from inside in the matters of social responsibility and re-evaluation, and we have practiced "safe selection" of reading materials to avoid undue controversy.

All of us can take a lesson from Lester Asheim in his now classic article, "Not Censorship but Selection."⁶ There is a very thin line between censorship and selection. The standards used by the censor and the selector are the same: subjective evaluation of the author's intention, the excellence of the writing, and the effect it may have on the reader. The results of the two processes are also the same; the material is unavailable whether it was censored or not selected. If there is a difference, he says, and there is, that difference lies in the manner and the atmosphere in which the decision is made. Quite simply the differences are these and all of us should keep them in mind.

The selector's approach to a book is positive. The censor's is negative. The selector looks for a reason to keep the book. The censor looks for a reason to delete it. The selector looks at the whole book; the censor dwells on parts of the book. The selector keeps his eye on the book; the censor frequently objects to the book on the basis of the author. The selector strives to protect the right of the reader to read, while the censor attempts to protect the reader from the presumed effects of his reading. The selector believes in liberty of thought; the censor would have thought control. The selector has faith in the intelligence of the

reader, whereas the censor has faith only in his own intelligence. Finally the selector's approach is democratic and the censor's is authoritarian.

In the light of these guidelines some of our "selection" is undoubtedly censorship and we cannot allow ourselves to mistake it. We cannot be censors and we cannot prefer one value over another in our zeal for intellectual freedom.

Values are changing, Toffler says, and communities are changing, for we are a mobile people. The community of today is not the same as the community of a year ago. The values of members of our community today are not the same as the values our community held a year ago. Some in our community would hold back on change, and some would push for more rapid change. As educators we must serve both factions of our community and we can, through intellectual freedom, providing we aren't patently offensive in our fight for it. We must realize that making books accessible does not give us license to flout staid conventionism nor does it grant us permission to promote materials likely to offend the personal values of others.

The dilemma between community values and intellectual freedom is one of perspective. Community values change constantly, but they cannot without intellectual freedom. To serve our community values we must remain ahead of them. To concentrate on the wart of momentary values distorts the purposes of education, which is to serve an ever-changing, ever-moving body of individuals. Strict adherence to good book selection policies for libraries and strong academic freedom resolutions for teachers are needed now more than ever, for new ideas and new values confront us on every turn. Some of these ideas are worthwhile, some scary, some awesome, some seductive, some absolutely worthless; but they are out there. These are the values being held by our people and we, as their leaders, must hurry and get ahead of them. Our people are gathering new values and new ideas all the time and we must forge ahead, open the door to them, and help examine them in the light of critical judgement. Our job is to serve on the front line between the cross-fire of changing values. It is an uncomfortable place to be; nonetheless, it is our place. We will be censured, to be sure. We will be damned if we do, and damned if we don't; but it is part of the job.

Many problems have to be solved; their solution will call for new and daring ideas. Community values must change, and will change, but hopefully through an intellectually free people who can make judgements based on wisdom, not ignorance. This is the true value of intellectual freedom.

Is there a dilemma? Not really. Community values can best be served if intellectual freedom is our goal. What we must do as educators then, is to convince our governing bodies that intellectual freedom become *the* community standard. Intellectual freedom is the only safe ground to stand upon, and the only one that can be defended from attacks on either side.

References

- 1 "What the Censors Attack in Children's Books," *Publishers Weekly*, March 11, 1974, p. 20.
- 2 Howard Fineman, "Goal of Pornography Panel is to Probe Public Opinion," *Louisville Courier-Journal and Times*, Dec. 23, 1973, p. A15.
- 3 Alvin Toffler, *Future Shock*. (New York: Bantam Books, 1971) p. 304.
- 4 David Berninghausen, "Social Responsibility vs. the Library Bill of Rights," *Library Journal*, Nov. 15, 1972, p. 3675-3681.
- 5 James A. Harvey, "Acting for the Children?" *Library Journal*, Feb. 15, 1973, p. 602-605.
- 6 Lester Asheim, "Not Censorship but Selection," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, September, 1953, p. 63-67.

INTELLECTUAL FREEDOM IN TENNESSEE: TRES PASOS ADELANTE

EDWIN S. GLEAVES*

We have often been reminded of the Chinese proverb, "A journey of a thousand miles begins with one step." Fewer of us know of the Spanish quotation attributed to Gonsalvo de Córdova, "Más quiero buscar la muerte dando tres pasos adelante, que vivir un siglo dando un sólo atrás" ("I would rather seek death by taking three steps forward than live a century by taking one step backward."). The latter quotation, I believe, is more appropriate to the work that has been done in the last two or three years toward achieving a better measure of intellectual freedom in the state of Tennessee. If the idea of seeking death appears a little melodramatic, I would suggest that such a struggle has its dangers and its challenges. Perhaps Mr. Spock on *Star Trek* put it best in responding to Captain Kirk's quip, "Sometimes Mr. Spock, I think I should have been a librarian." Said Mr. Spock: "Being a librarian, Captain Kirk, would be no less challenging, though perhaps somewhat less dangerous."

Librarians and teachers of English in Tennessee have, I believe, taken *tres pasos adelante* recently in response to a chain of events which began at least as early as February of 1972. On February 11 of that year the following article appeared in the *Knoxville Journal*:

Rather than remove certain books from the school library system, the Anderson County Board of Education approved measures Thursday night removing obligation on the part of any student to read supplementary literature which his parents consider objectionable.

* Director, Programs for Educational Support Personnel, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee.

With more than 200 parents, students and teachers present at the board meeting in Clinton, school board members ended controversy which has plagued the last four sessions and stirred mixed emotions in area residents.

The county school controversy about certain books arose at Clinton High School recently when some students objected to such books as "Catcher in the Rye," "Catch 22" and "Manchild in the Promised Land." Various parents then organized citizen meetings to determine what recourse they would have in getting these books removed from school libraries.

... Although the Board's action [to place the books on a restricted list] was taken rather quickly, the controversy elicited spirited reactions from many in the audience as well as school board member Finley Reed, who stated flatly that "filthy books" should be removed from the library system.

Eyewitness accounts of the meetings at the Anderson County Court House over a period of days indicated that "spirited reactions" was uncharacteristically a journalistic understatement, for emotions ran very high in opposition to such books as *Catcher in the Rye* and *Catch 22*, while librarians and English teachers in the area reacted just as strongly in their defense. Paul Bostic, superintendent of schools, apparently took the side of his fellow educators, and his decision to take a compromise course of action was felt to be the only sensible answer to the problem—and even then many parents were not at all satisfied.

While echoes of this new "monkey trial" (which also took place in East Tennessee) were still being heard, police and district attorneys in Nashville were clamping down in a "campaign against smut," which, in this case, was aimed less at the schools than at the "adult" bookstores. Within months, some bookstore owners and employees had been convicted.

It was in the same year, 1972, that "a resolution calling upon the Department of Education to develop guidelines barring the use of offensive literature in the public schools" was passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Tennessee. The language and the intent of this resolution are illustrative of the climate of opinion of state legislatures at the time:

WHEREAS, our founding fathers, in establishing both our Republic, and our great State, were men of deep religious and moral ideals; and

WHEREAS, this is evidenced by the many spiritual and moral declarations in our national and state documents; and

WHEREAS, this same moral and spiritual heritage remains in our people today; and

WHEREAS, the Preamble of our national Constitution promises the promotion of the general welfare of our citizens; and

WHEREAS, the general welfare involves the spiritual and moral environment in which they and their children abide; and

WHEREAS, in this day of much permissiveness, there is a tendency to tolerate textbooks and approved reading lists in our school systems to [sic, properly "which"] contain much profanity, vulgarity, al-

lusions to, and descriptions of, illicit sexual acts, and the use of the name of the Diety [sic] in a vain and profane manner; and

WHEREAS, though there are abundant textbook series and read-materials available that are relatively free of such offensive material, at both the state and many local levels, textbooks and reading lists are selected and approved which contain all the objectional [sic] content cited above; and

WHEREAS, such content is contrary to the moral and spiritual climate found in the home and church life of our citizens; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE, THE SENATE CONCURRING, That this body declares its disapproval of such textbooks and reading lists which contents use the name of the Diety [sic] in vain, profanity and lewdness in word and description, and other such categories of literature which glorify illicit or perverted sexual activities, and which categories of literature violate the moral and spiritual consciences of our people; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That this body calls upon the Commissioner of the Department of Education to develop, and then report to this General Assembly, guidelines which shall be laid down at the state level barring such offensive content in literature that is used by the students in the public school systems in our State.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Commission of Education send copies of this Resolution to each and every school board member in this State.

Adopted: April 4, 1972

This resolution was signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Speaker of the Senate, and approved and signed on April 10 by Governor Winfield Dunn.

The first *paso adelante* in Tennessee could best be described as an evasive action on the part of those who were called upon to respond to the resolution. The school library supervisor at that time, James Cantrell, was given interim responsibility of recommending a course of action concerning "guidelines" to be developed, and he in turn called together a group of library educators in the state to consider this and other matters before him at that time. After due deliberation, this group framed its own informal resolution commending the guidelines of the American Association of School Libraries (AASL) which, judiciously applied at the local level, could provide positive guidelines for the development of library collections. This response, of course, did not address itself to all textbooks and reading lists, and it was—to be honest—probably more of a gesture to satisfy the spirit of the law in the resolution. Action taken subsequent to this response apparently has been little, although it may yet be necessary to develop a rather specific set of guidelines to fulfill the intent of the resolution. It was the feeling of the *ad hoc* group which met to consider the resolution that the more specific such a set of guidelines became, the more difficult it would be to enforce and to make proper allowances for differences in communities across the state. Ob-

viously, no attempt has been made on the part of librarians and teachers to pursue the implementation of this resolution.

The second *paso adelante* in Tennessee was definitely more significant. Subsequent to the Supreme Court ruling of June, 1972, it became increasingly evident that every state legislature would be addressing itself to a "pornography bill." Well in advance of the convening of the 1974 Tennessee Legislature, a group of concerned librarians in the state were called together by James E. Ward, President of the Tennessee Library Association, to consider measures to be taken to influence the passage of a reasonable piece of legislation. This group, dubbed the "Special Committee for Legislation on Obscene Materials," drafted, with the special assistance of Richard A. Searles, Jr., Law Librarian, University of Tennessee at Nashville, a statement of concern which, while admittedly a little self-serving, was aimed specifically at obtaining a library exclusion clause in the new bill. The statement read, in part, as follows:

It is our understanding that legislation is currently being drafted which will seek to control or eliminate the availability of obscene materials within this state. We would like very much to have the position of libraries to be noted as this drafting occurs.

Our specific concerns are several:

- (1) Legislation not intended to be applicable to libraries may be used against them anyway if libraries are not noted as a specific exclusion.
- (2) Legislation defining obscene materials may fail to take into account the legitimate social utility of various materials when collected by libraries for specific instructional purposes, or of materials widely accepted as part of our American literary heritage.
- (3) Legislation defining obscene materials by specific descriptions of what may not be portrayed graphically often fails to be worded in such a manner as to exclude materials such as the great works of art, physiology texts, etc.

We recognize that any proposed statute would not be aimed at libraries. We recognize further that any application of a general statute against librarians is improbable. We feel, however, that the statute itself must make clear its limitations. If this is not done, the chance that the statute will eventually be used against a librarian acting in a professional capacity will be greatly enhanced. . . .

As a final point we would note that legislation to control libraries is unnecessary. Historically librarians in Tennessee have shown a sense of responsibility in providing appropriate materials to meet community needs, for which they have been professionally trained. Control of acquisitions policies lies and should continue to remain with the administration of the library which is charged with satisfying the purposes for which the library was established and is maintained.

Having drafted these high-sounding words, the Committee then addressed itself to getting the statement into the hands of those who could most influence legislation, the final decision being to approach, through the State Librarian and Archivist, Katherine Culbertson, the Assistant Attorney General for the State of Tennessee, Hayes Cooney, who at that

time was in the process of drawing up a bill to be sponsored, eventually, by Senator Douglas Henry of Nashville. At the same time, a number of individuals contacted Senator Henry concerning his bill and the likelihood of including a library exclusion clause. Senator Henry's response was positive. In a letter to me, Senator Henry stated, "My objective in sponsoring the Attorney General's bill on obscenity is only to suppress hard-core pornography and not to interfere with libraries in any way." Senator Henry's bill was one of at least three bills which were being considered by the Legislature at that time, and was the only bill to include a library exclusion clause. His was, incidentally, the longest and the most thorough of the bills, although certainly not the most restrictive. Fortunately, Senator Henry's bill prevailed, and it sailed through the Legislature in record time, notwithstanding the section which to the gratification of those of us who had fought for such a statement, contained the following clause:

The provision of this Act shall not, however, be applicable to a "library" as defined in Section 69-202, Tennessee Code Annotated.

The appropriate section of Tennessee Code Annotated indeed defines "library" to the satisfaction of the most demanding librarian-lexicographer, including, as it does, even office libraries in the state.

Because this library exclusion clause refers only to libraries *per se*, it should be pointed out that the bill sponsored by Senator Henry could hardly be construed to apply to teachers of literature in the state, the emphasis being on the selling and distribution of allegedly pornographic materials through the conventional retail markets. Thus far, the law has not, to my knowledge, been tested, and it remains to be seen if, in its application, it is found to be unduly harsh, or if some enterprising legislator brings up the possibility of amending the law in order to exclude the library exclusion clause. Should an Anderson County Event arise again, anything is possible in the State Legislature. But as of now, the Legislature has followed the course of action least injurious to librarians and educators in the state.

The third *paso adelante* was happening concurrently with the efforts to influence the so-called pornography bill, and may itself have had some influence on the final outcome. This was a series of workshops on intellectual freedom sponsored by the Tennessee Library Association in coordination with local institutions and organizations. The first, sponsored in conjunction with the West Tennessee Library Association and the Memphis State University Department of Library Science, took place on Saturday, February 9, at Memphis State University; the second, co-sponsored by the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Tennessee, took place on Saturday, February 23, at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; and the final session, sponsored in conjunction with the Mid-State Library Association and the School of Library Science of George Peabody College for Teachers, was held at

the Kresge Learning Resource Center of Meharry Medical College on Saturday, March 9. I was privileged to participate along with two colleagues as "key resource discussion leaders" in each of the three workshops: William Robinson, Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Tennessee at Knoxville; and Helen D. Lockhart, Coordinator of Community Relations and Adult Programs, Memphis Public Library and Information Center. In addition, keynote speakers at each workshop provided the intellectual stimulus for the discussions which followed. The speaker at the meeting in Memphis was Herminio Traviesas, Vice-President for Broadcast Standards, National Broadcasting Company; in Knoxville: Dr. Jack Reese, Chancellor of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville; Nashville: Dr. E. R. Hutchison, Professor of English (and author of books on censorship), George Peabody College for Teachers.

Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of these workshops was the high level of attendance and enthusiasm which characterized all three. Even as Saturday meetings, each was attended by 85-100 persons, most of them, though not all, librarians in the area. Materials which had been developed for the prototype workshop on intellectual freedom sponsored by the American Library Association in Chicago, April, 1973, were distributed to all participants, and each resource discussion leader was assigned a topic for all three sessions. (In Memphis, a number of other discussion leaders helped keep the groups small and intimate.) Since these workshops were being held while the Tennessee State Legislature was in session, each session was used as an opportunity to update all participants on recent events and to urge participants to contact their local legislators in support of enlightened legislation concerning obscenity and pornography.

The directors of the workshops (both members of the TLA Intellectual Freedom Committee), Eleanor L. Dempster and Robert Kester, both of the University of Tennessee, worked with other members of the Intellectual Freedom Committee and with cooperating agencies throughout the state to plan what turned out to be a rather complicated series of one-day workshops. Mrs. Dempster and Mr. Kester both felt that the series did go very well, and that the workshops provided, not only a forum for discussion and information, but provided a framework for other workshops, conferences, and seminars at the local level aimed not only at librarians and teachers but at those trustees and citizens who, in the future, are going to influence public policy.

Recollecting in tranquility the events of the last two to three years, it becomes increasingly obvious that it is the citizens of the state who are going to determine policy and attitudes toward censorship versus freedom of expression. The attitudes of the citizenry will be influenced by a frustrating array of sources, ranging from President Ford to the most hysterical crusader for censorship. The role that the librarian and the teacher can play in such a process can be seen, perhaps to some extent,

in the events which have been described above. To whatever extent any efforts by educators can involve the citizenry, the likelihood of success will be increased. Still, I see no prescription for responding to unforeseen events. Like handling complaints in a public library, they are simply too unpredictable to be reduced to a formula. The injunction of Jesus "to be wise as serpents and as harmless as doves" is perhaps the safest rule to follow.

ON THE SEDUCTION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

DR. JAMES E. BARCUS
Houghton College

The world has never, and never will suffer from a shortage of prophets of doom. Simon's pipings about shortages of energy have joined the earlier cries of the butcher and baker; only the candlestick maker has not been heard from. And now we hear that the arts, the humanities, the humane disciplines face a rough passage with more than three men in the tub. As the chancellor of an empirically oriented California state college put it, "So what's new in Chaucer, baby?" To young articulate Ph.D.'s aspiring to first jobs in first-rate institutions and to mid-career articulate Ph.D.'s facing dwindling class enrollments, the shortage of opportunities in the humanities is a tale of sound and fury, sometimes sheer jabberwockery. Poor governmental planning and foresight combined with extremely effective parenthood planning are contributing causes—causes over which we have little control. But is there nothing we as English teachers can do?

For one thing we can define our jobs more precisely, and by doing so, release some frustrations and irritations which sap our energy. The English teacher is often impaled on two apparently conflicting purposes: the need for literacy and the desire to teach and propagate "the best that has been thought and said in all the world." For many English teachers the former is a drudge, a cross to be borne sacrificially, even nobly (at times), certainly a shibboleth to pay lip service to, but, in fact, the source of faculty lunch room jokes and jibes. The latter purpose, the function of criticism according to Arnold, spreads a large umbrella to cover a multitude of activities including philosophizing, regurgitating (sometimes known as vomiting), psychoanalyzing, and just plain bull, as well as some enlightened and humane instruction in the arts.

I suggest that we English teachers take a hard and fresh look at the task of literacy. Declining SAT scores reveal that more and more American students know less and less about their native language. Certainly the push for innovation and flexibility in scheduling and curriculum have contributed to the decline in national norms. But I also believe that

we have lost the vision as teachers—or perhaps we never had it. Certainly, as I prepared for secondary teaching, the art of teaching literacy was never presented so as to challenge me. Where is the vision which led English Quakers and Dissenters to establish Sabbath-Day Schools for the purpose of *literacy* and religious instruction? Do we see the pillar of fire which led thousands of American youths into literacy work around the world under the Peace Corps? Or have we like Lot's wife turned our backs on the task before us, yearning for a city we think a Camelot but actually a Sodom and Gomorrah? Are we pillars of salt frozen and immobile or are we the very salt of the earth?

I do not imply, nor should you infer, that I necessarily propose homework assignments in which students diagram 20 sentences (although I do not think that a necessarily bad exercise in the hands of an expert teacher). I do not propose a return to the English teaching methodology of 1930 or 1950 or 1960. Rather, I propose a concerted rearrangement of our priorities and value judgments to make room for the dedicated and effective teacher of English grammar, spelling, and syntax. A plumber never receives as much respect as he deserves until the sewer backs up. And I fear that the noxious fumes in academia indicate that we need some expert plumbers of English. In addition, like Lot's wife, we have failed to see the promise of the unexpected and unknown, especially the potentially effective innovations in individualized and auto-instructional materials. While these are no panacea for all ills, in fundamental areas like spelling and punctuation we have not begun to use them to advantage.

Let us turn, however, to that other task, that one for which we all read *King Lear* and the *Miller's Tale*, that task for which we wrote term papers exploring Milton's readings in rabbinical literature. When all is said and done, most English teachers teach because they like and respond "to the best that has been thought and said in all the world." But the fact is that our students, in that common vulgarism I try to avoid, are not turned on by *Macbeth*, or *Rape of the Lock*, or Wordsworth's "primal sympathy in what remains behind." In fact, even Steinbeck, Vonnegut and Kesey sometimes have little appeal for even my college students. (I am not speaking of English majors.) Why this unconcern, this lack of interest in the arts and literature?

I believe we English teachers have been seduced, not just once, but several times. Believing our suitors honest men, we have been reduced to harlotry. In our enthusiasm to join in every educational fad and pedagogical innovation, we have ignored the wisdom of our parents. We were first seduced by the scientific method. This is not an attack on science, but rather on our ignorance. Impressed by the real achievements of the scientific method and ignorant of the values of other ways of knowing, we imitated the methodology, producing a great bustle, but not the thing itself. First, we decided that, like science, the arts were for everybody. As Norman Brown has pointed out, "science is the

attempt to democratize knowledge." I know I lay myself open to the charge of elitism, of cultural chauvinism, but it seems to me that efforts to convince every American that literature or culture or art matters is a futile enterprise. Breastbeating, sackcloth and ashes do nothing to change the fact that it is infinitely easier to dissect and memorize the anatomy of a cat than it is to understand the architectonics of Mozart's symphonies, or to enter Milton's cosmos as he tosses worlds into space. I do not imply that we should not try to communicate such mysteries. I do insist, however, that unsung Miltons are few indeed and the readers of Milton, sung or unsung, will always be few in deed. Even Matthew Arnold, a professional educator and humanist, knew this. "The mass of mankind," he said, "will never have any ardent zeal for seeing things as they are; very inadequate ideas will always satisfy them." It is not a question of the classics versus the moderns, of Milton versus Lawrence Durrell. The question is quality. The masses will always be satisfied with very inadequate ideas.

Moreover, we have been seduced by the scientific methodology's penchant for explaining things, for seeking to answer the question how. For the scientist the unexplained is always a source of frustration, a thorn festering in his mind. To the artist who always asks why, the unexplained is hopefully the inexplicable and therefore the source of Xanadu. Such pleasure domes, measureless to man, speak of mysteries worth contemplating as mysteries. The consecrated Host, the mystery of the Incarnation, the blunder of Narcissus, and the first figurative and then literal blindness of Oedipus are mysteries in the selves. The adoration of such mysteries by the faithful will never be understood by the protesting empiricists of this world.

Are then our efforts futile? No. Arnold pointed out that "whoever sets himself to see things as they are will find himself one of a very small circle; but it is only by this small circle resolutely doing its own work that adequate ideas will ever get current at all." The time has come to find the mysteries again. I don't know whether Arnold would assess our age an epoch of creative expansion or one of critical concentration, but as Norman Brown argues in his wonderful Phi Beta Kappa address, "Apocalypse: the Place of Mystery in the Life of the Mind," "there come times when civilization has to be renewed by the discovery of new mysteries."

Discovering new mysteries is not an easy task nor are we English teachers prepared for such arduous work. To begin with, we must exorcize the past. We are demon-possessed. Books ride us. As Arnold assessed his own times, he saw much bustle, but little thought. As Brown phrases it, "we have the bookworm rather than Man Thinking." I am not joining the McLuhan Club or the army of devotees of TV instruction. In fact, Sesame Street represents a new kind of bondage, a bondage to leaping lizards and skipping skunks. Such a witches' brew prohibits all thinking by drugging the sensibilities and stifling all questions. An 1 is

an l is an l, and a word is only a word according to Sesame Street. But we lovers of language, words, and ideas know that a word is more than a word. It is associations, sound, rhythm; it has a past, a present, and, if we are lucky, a future. Instead of riding our knowledge, our knowledge rides us.

Moreover, our complacency undermines our efforts to lead students to the oracle. We are often the blind leading the blind, but unlike Teiresias we are spiritually blind. A recent *Christian Science Monitor* writer argues that Americans are becoming too well educated! Poppycock! Training for job skills is a noble and necessary good, but education never ends with minimum skills. Using the English language that way is rape and proves my thesis. We have not educated when students can read and write, although literacy as I have already insisted must be attended to. We are too content to stand in the outer court of the Gentiles, not even glimpsing the Holy of Holies.

Finally we have been seduced by the prevailing winds of value-free education. Believing falsely that the empirical method is objective and therefore better (it is neither objective nor value-free), we imitated a rocking horse and thought it Pegasus. In criticism, for example, formalism in the hands of the least competent teachers has come to epitomize the sterility which can beset the teaching of the most fundamentally humane of all the arts—poetry.

Not until we English teachers hear the music of the spheres again, not until unicorns graze on our lawns and nibble from our fingers, and not until hobbits invite us home for tea will we speak again with authority. The elevation of such mysteries is a holy occupation, but there is holiness as well in feeding the poor and tending the sick. Both a cup of cold water and a sip of wine are necessary, and in the hands of a Miracle Worker, water was changed to wine.

ALIENATION TIMES SEVEN IN HEMINGWAY'S "SOLDIER'S HOME"

DANIEL R. SILKOWSKI

Maine Township High School, Des Plaines, Illinois

Anthony J. Petrarca has already pointed out the irony of situation in Hemingway's "Soldier's Home" (*English Journal*, 58, May, 1969, pp. 664-667). The ironies develop as the alienation increases. Just as students may easily miss the irony in the story, so too may they overlook the causes of alienation which Hemingway presents. I believe at least seven such causes are discernible.

While the first two sentences, "Krebs went to the war" from a Methodist college in Kansas. There is a picture which shows him among

his fraternity brothers, all of them wearing exactly the same height and style collar,"¹ give nothing to distinguish him from his college chums, the fact that it is a small Midwestern college and the fact that he did belong to a fraternity must have given him some kind of identity and sense of belonging.

With the coming of the war, however, Krebs, is thrown into a milieu of such dimension that whatever identity he may have had is lost because he is now but one of millions, barely distinguishable in a photograph, wearing an ill-fitting uniform which further destroys any individuality that earlier might have been exhibited in his manner of dress. Thus, the first two causes of alienation, the war and the number of people involved, uproot him from a stable environment, reduce him to a military number and a surname only (notice it is not until much later that we learn his Christian name), and place him in a foreign land wherein even the mystery, magic, and Romance of Europe are overshadowed by the war and its related activities.

The third alienating force is time.

He enlisted in the Marines in 1917 and did not return to the United States until the second division returned from the Rhine in the summer of 1919 . . . By the time Krebs returned to his home town in Oklahoma the greeting of heroes was over. He came back much too late. The men from the town who had been drafted had all been welcomed elaborately on their return. There had been a great deal of hysteria. Now the reaction had set in. People seemed to think it was rather ridiculous for Krebs to be getting back so late, years after the war was over. (207)

On his return, Krebs encounters both scorn and skepticism; thus he does not get the recognition he needs for having belonged to a group. He is a Johnny-come-lately, an outsider.

In his effort to overcome this exclusion, Krebs cannot rely on the mere fact that he is a veteran. Once more, number works against him. Too many veterans have already returned and told too many tales about the war. Thus, striving to join this group, Krebs is confronted by the fourth force of alienation, the combined complexity of fact and fiction.

Despite the fact that he had participated in several of the most famous battles of World War I, i.e., Belleau Wood, Soissons, the Champagne, St. Mihiel, the Argonne, the fictions already generated, e.g. "detailed accounts of German women found chained to machine guns in the Argonne forest" (208), overshadow that fact. When he encounters "another man who had really been a soldier" (208) who, in private, admits with Krebs the fact that they "had been badly, sickeningly

¹ This and subsequent references are from Hemingway's "Soldier's Home" as it appears in Robert P. Warren and Albert Erskine, editors, *Short Story Masterpieces*, (New York: Dell Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 207-215. Numbers in parentheses refer to pages in that edition.

frightened all the time," (208) the popular fiction that heroes never know fear again cuts off any further attempt to identify with his peers, unless he is willing to alienate himself from the truth by concocting fictional exploits. "Krebs acquired the nausea in regard to experience that is the result of untruth or exaggeration . . . In this way he lost everything." (208) Fact and fiction alienate him.

History shows the problems veterans have in readjusting to civilian life. Psychologists try to explain the causes for maladjustments. In Krebs' case, the fifth force that alienates him is this same pressure to resume his normal, pre-war life. His mother and father have clear-cut ideas about his future:

Your father is worried, too," his mother went on. "He thinks you have lost your ambition, that you haven't got a definite aim in life. Charley Simmons, who is just your age, has a good job and is going to be married. The boys are all settling down; they're all determined to get somewhere; you can see that boys like Charley Simmons are on their way to being really a credit to the community." (213)

We want you to enjoy yourself. But you are going to have to settle down to work, Harold. Your father doesn't care what you start at. All work is honorable as he says. But you've got to make a start at something. (213)

But Krebs prefers to drift, playing his clarinet or lounging in the pool hall. Neither activity will lead him anywhere. His clarinet playing is a solitary activity, and even at the pool hall his recreation is more internal and personal than external and social. The same is true for his reading the book about the war. The history and maps are things he can identify with; they give him a sense of belonging, for he was there. But they are in the past. His present cannot adjust to the past, and the pressures to do so serve only to alienate him further.

His mother's concern for his welfare, especially her inquiry, "Have you decided what you are going to do yet, Harold?" (212), sets the stage for another force to alienate her son. She would like to see him, like Charley Simmons, settle down and get married. Marriage presupposes a substratum of love; love in turn demands involvement. Yet Krebs deliberately alienates himself from such involvement, claiming "it wasn't worth it." (209) This rationalization to thwart involvement is so strong that it even suppresses the basic biological urge.

Vaguely he wanted a girl but he did not want to have to work to get her. He would have liked to have a girl but he did not want to have to spend a long time getting her. He did not want to get into the intrigue and the politics. He did not want to have to do any courting. He did not want to tell any more lies. It wasn't worth it.

He did not want any consequences. He did not want any consequences ever again. He wanted to live along without consequences, (209)

Perhaps it is the combination of personal involvement that love de-

mands, coupled with the experience of exterminating life in war, that nullifies the procreative urge. Paradoxically, even if initially motivated by nothing more than mere physical desire, love does not lead Krebs to involvement, but rather to alienation.

At first glance, it would seem that Krebs' response to his sister's question, "Do you love me?" (212), contradicts the foregoing. But he can easily make his reply in the affirmative for he knows it carries no real involvement, no real commitment beyond agreeing to watch his sister play baseball. When his mother asks him the same question, "Don't you love your mother, dear boy?" (213), he must in honesty answer, "No."

This alienation extends beyond human involvement. Even the seventh force, the power of religion, cannot bring Krebs back to the fold. His mother's claim that "God has some work for everyone to do. There can be no idle hands in His Kingdom," (213) elicits from him the ultimate separation: "I'm not in His Kingdom." (213)

Spiritually isolated, it remains only for the last alienation to occur, a mere physical extension of that spiritual alienation.

He would go to Kansas City and get a job. (214)

Neither body nor spirit has a place, a home; too many forces have conspired against him. Uprooted by the war, swallowed up by numbers, misplaced by time, distorted by fact and fiction, unable to adjust to a former life, denying love and personal commitment, excluding himself from an all-embracing God, Krebs is the ultimate outcast.